

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/865,750

Applicant(s)  
Shirota et al.

Examiner  
Ljiljana V. Ciric

Art Unit  
3753

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ljiljana V. Ciric

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Michael J. Schmidt, Reg. No. 34,007

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Oct 6, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, 5, 14, 16, 19, 20, 29, 39, and 40

Identification of prior art discussed:

JP 1-153321 (of record); U.S. Patent No. 5,701,753 (issued to Iritani, of record); U.S. Patent No. 5,505,060 (issued to Kozinski, of record)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney Schmidt telephoned Examiner Ciric to discuss the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, as applied in the previous Office action. Examiner Ciric clarified the rejections by explaining that the accumulator of Figure 2 is disclosed as only having air and not as having refrigerant flowing therethrough, hence claiming that the cold accumulating material in the accumulator is sealed from the refrigerant is misleading and constitutes new matter. Consensus was reached that removing the related limitations from the claims would obviate the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs. Also, Attorney Schmidt proposed reciting a "self-contained" cold accumulator to differentiate the cold accumulator of the instant invention from the refrigerant flow-through ones of JP 1-153321 and of Iritani (see above). Examiner Ciric did not object to this proposal, but recommended that applicant present arguments relating thereto in the response to the previous Office action for further consideration of this matter.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required